

Runnymede Borough Council

PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 March 2009 at 7.30pm

Members of the Committee present: Councillors G B Woodger (Chairman), D W Parr (Vice-Chairman), Mrs F M Angell, Mrs F J Barden, Mrs P I Broadhead, R J Edis, Mrs E Gill, Mrs L M Gillham, C Knight, M T Kusneraitis, Mrs Y P Lay, H W V Meares, Mrs M Roberts, N Stewert and P B Tuley

Members of the Committee absent: None

Councillors Mrs M T Harnden and J J Wilson also attended.

548. NOTIFICATION OF CHANGES TO COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

The Groups mentioned below had notified the Chief Executive of their wish that the changes listed below be made to the membership of the Committee. The changes were for a fixed period ending on the day after the meeting and thereafter the Councillors removed would be reappointed.

Group Requiring Change	Remove from Membership	Appoint Instead
Conservative	Councillor J R Furey	Councillor Mrs P Broadhead
Conservative	Councillor J M Edwards	Councillor R J Edis
Runnymede Independent	Councillor J R Ashmore	Councillor Mrs L M Gillham

The Chief Executive Officer had given effect to those wishes in accordance with Section 16(2) of the Local Government and Housing Act 1989.

549. MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 18 February 2009 were approved and signed as a correct record.

550. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The planning applications listed below were considered by the Committee. All representations received on the applications were reported and copies were made available for inspection by Members before the meeting. Applicants' agents addressed the Committee on the applications indicated below.

RESOLVED that –

the following applications be determined as indicated and any permission granted be subject to the Conditions authorised.

<u>APP NO</u>	<u>LOCATION, PROPOSAL AND DECISION</u>
RU 08/1206	100 – 106 Church Road, Addlestone Erection of 2 buildings to provide 48 bedroom extra care home, parking for 12 cars and 5 cycles and widened access adjacent to 108 Church Road, following demolition of existing buildings for car sales and maintenance.

DECISION: REFUSE for the following reasons:

- 1) **The proposed development, by reason of scale, height, width, depth, mass, bulk, number of buildings, proximity to common boundaries and layout and site coverage of buildings and parking would be a prominent and incongruous form of development, with a cramped appearance and over-development of the site would have a detrimental impact on the visual amenities of the street scene and the character and pattern of the surrounding area. The scheme fails to improve the character and quality of this area, and is contrary to saved Policies BE2 and HO9 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration 2001, saved Policies LO2 and SE4 of the Surrey Structure Plan 2004, Planning Policy Statement 1: 'Delivering Sustainable Development'; Planning Policy Statement 3: 'Housing', By Design and Surrey Design.**
- 2) **The applicant has failed to demonstrate that the site is suitable for the proposed use and that future occupiers would not be at risk from contamination and that contamination would not spread to surrounding land. The proposal is therefore contrary to Planning Policy Statement 23 : Planning and Pollution Control.**
- 3) **The applicant has failed to demonstrate that the development would be designed to include a minimum of 10% of energy requirements to be provided by renewable resources. The applicant has not submitted any renewable energy statement with the application. On this basis the proposal therefore fails to satisfy saved Policy SE2 of the Surrey Structure Plan 2004 and the Council's Interim Advice Note on Renewable Energy.**

(Mr Kendall, agent for applicant, addressed the Committee on the above application).

RU 08/1221

**Great Grove Farm, Murray Road, Ottershaw
Erection of 12 dwellings and the retention of the existing farmhouse, together with associated parking, landscaping, access and paddocks, following demolition of all other existing buildings.**

DECISION: REFUSE for the following reasons:

1. **The application site is located within the Green Belt wherein the proposed new residential development would constitute inappropriate development, which would be harmful and detrimental to the openness and visual amenities of the Green Belt and would conflict with the purposes of the Green Belt, contrary to advice contained within Planning Policy Guidance Note 2 : Green Belts, saved Policy LO4 of the Surrey Structure Plan 2004 and saved Policy GB1 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration April 2001.**
2. **The proposed development would by reason of its scale, mass, floor area, bulk, height, close proximity of buildings to each other and boundaries, character of**

the proposed dwellings and the spread of development on the site result in a cramped form of development and the urbanisation of this Green Belt site. This would be detrimental to the openness and visual amenities of the Green Belt. The proposed development would therefore fail to improve the character and quality of the area, contrary to saved Policies LO4, SE4 and SE5 of the Surrey Structure Plan 2004, saved Policies GB1 and HO9 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration 2001 and advice contained within Planning Policy Guidance Note 2 : Green Belts, Planning Policy Statement 1 : Delivering Sustainable Development and Planning Policy Statement 3 : 'Housing'.

- 3. Notwithstanding the information submitted by the applicant, the Local Planning Authority do not consider that very special circumstances have been put forward in support of this application to justify the granting of planning permission, contrary to saved Policy GB1 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration April 2001, saved Policy LO4 of the Surrey Structure Plan 2004 and advice with Planning Policy Guidance Note 2 : Green Belts.**
- 4. The Borough has an up to date five year supply of land for housing that is suitable, achievable and available in accordance with the requirements of Planning Policy Statement 3 : Housing. This supply can also be achieved without having to consider a number of additional sites, shown on the Council's housing trajectory as delivering dwellings in the 5 year period up to March 2013 but which do not yet have the benefit of planning permission. The proposed development of this site for housing would lead to an over-provision of housing beyond that required and would undermine the regulation of the supply of housing land, pending the assessment of future housing sites in the Borough as part of the Local Development Framework process in line with the requirements of the emerging South East Plan. The proposal is therefore premature and contrary to saved Policies LO4 and LO6 of the Surrey Structure Plan 2004 and saved Policy HO8 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration 2001, and Planning Policy Statement 3 : Housing.**
- 5. The applicant has failed to demonstrate that affordable housing provision will be provided in accordance with the requirements in the Council's Adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance : Affordable Housing, including the securing of an acceptable completed unilateral undertaking. The application is therefore contrary to saved Policy DN11 of the Surrey Structure Plan 2004 and saved Policy HO4 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration 2001, Adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance : Affordable Housing 2007 and Planning Policy Statement 3 'Housing'.**
- 6. The application does not propose to make any payments for Infrastructure Contributions in accordance with the Council's Adopted Supplementary**

Planning Guidance (SPG) on Planning Obligations December 2007, which took effect for new proposals submitted on and after 1 April 2008. The SPG was prepared as a collaboration with Surrey County Council and other Surrey Districts after consultation in order to take account of the cumulative impact of development on infrastructure and was commended in the Panel Report on the South East Plan in August 2007. As a result the proposal is also contrary to Saved Policy DN1 of the Surrey Structure Plan 2004, Policies CC5 and LF5 of the Draft South East Plan (as amended by the Panel Report) and national advice in Circular 05/2005.

- 7. The application does not propose to make any payments for SANGS Contributions to the Council and makes no provision for his own mitigation and is contrary to the Council's Adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area 2008 and saved Policy NE16 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration 2001. This is likely to have an adverse effect on the integrity of the Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area and would not be in accordance with the Habitats Regulations 1994 and Article 6(3) of directive 92/43/EEC.**
- 8. The applicant has failed to demonstrate that the site is suitable for the proposed use and that future occupiers would not be at risk from contamination and that contamination would not spread to surrounding land. The proposal is therefore contrary to Planning Policy Statement 23 : Planning and Pollution Control.**

(Mr Armstrong, agent for applicant, addressed the Committee on the above application).

RU 09/0047

299 – 303 & Land to rear of 297 Green Lane, Chertsey Demolition of No 301 Green Lane and erection of 11 no x two storey dwellings (one terrace of 3 no x 3 bed houses and 4 no pairs of semi-detached 3 bed houses) with new access road, parking, landscaping and ancillary works.

DECISION: REFUSE for the following reasons:-

- 1. The proposed development of 11 dwellings on this site, by reason of the layout of buildings and their associated plots, their scale, bulk, massing, height, proximity to shared boundaries, loss of trees and insufficient space for replacement planting, in conjunction with the extent of hard surfacing to the front of the proposed dwellings, would result in an unacceptable cramped and piecemeal backland form of development out of scale and character with the existing development in the locality and would be harmful to character and visual amenities of the area. The proposal would fail to integrate into the local area and fail to improve the character and quality of the area, contrary to saved Policy SE4 of the Surrey Structure Plan 2004, saved Policies HO9, BE2, NE12 and NE14 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration April 2001, Planning Policy Statement 3 – Housing, Planning Policy Statement 1 –**

Delivering Sustainable Development, Surrey Design and By Design.

- 2. The proposed dwellings, by reason of their scale, bulk, massing, heights, position of windows and their siting in close proximity to the site boundaries and existing neighbouring dwellings, would be overbearing and visually intrusive, and an unneighbourly form of development, which would result in overlooking and loss of privacy which would be harmful to the residential amenities of adjoining dwellings, particularly No 12A Jersey Close, Nos 11 – 15 Gordon Close and Nos 297 and 305 Green Lane, contrary to saved Policy HO9 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration April 2001.**
- 3. The application does not propose to make any payments for Infrastructure Contributions in accordance with the Council's Adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Planning Obligations December 2007 which took effect for new proposals submitted on and after 1 April 2008. This SPG was prepared as a collaboration with Surrey County Council and other Surrey Districts after consultation in order to take account of the cumulative impact of development on infrastructure and was commended in the Panel Report on the South East Plan in August 2007. As a result the proposal is also contrary to Saved Policy DN1 of the Surrey Structure Plan 2004, Policies CC5 and LF5 of the draft South East Plan (as amended by the Panel Report) and national advice in Circular 05/2005.**
- 4. The applicant does not propose to make any payments for SANGS contributions to the Council and makes no provision for his own mitigation and is contrary to the Council's Adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance on the Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area 2008 and saved Policy NE16 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration April 2001. This is likely to have an adverse effect on the integrity of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area and would not be in accordance with the Habitats Regulations 1994 and Article 6(3) of directive 92/43/EEC.**

(Councillor Edis gave notice that he had predetermined the application and accordingly withdrew from the room and took no part in discussion thereon).

RU 08/1213

**105 Crockford Park Road, Addlestone
Retrospective application for a garage conversion into a residential annex incorporating an increase in ridge height of garage and the insertion of a side dormer window to storage level in roof and erection of an external staircase.**

DECISION: REFUSE for the following reason:-

- i) The height and scale of the residential annex and its cramped relationship with the main dwelling and the adjoining dwelling is considered to be an incongruous feature in the street scene, detrimental to the amenity of the area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Saved Policy SE4 of the Surrey Structure Plan 2004, Saved Policies BE2 and HO9 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration 2001 and Adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance Householder Guide 2003.**
- ii) a report be made to a future meeting regarding enforcement action.**

(A Motion to grant permission was LOST).

RU 09/0059

**Arboretum University of London, Harvest Road, Englefield Green
Works to trees subject to TPO 172 comprising felling of 21 trees, plus management works to 123 individual trees (pruning, crown lifting, crown reduction, coppicing, removal of deadwood and crown cleaning works).**

DECISION: GRANT, subject to Conditions and additional Informatives as per addendum and subject to removal of feral brushwood from periphery of site.

551. APPEAL DECISIONS

The Committee noted that the Planning Inspectorate had recently determined the appeals mentioned below.

<u>Site/Development</u>	<u>Decision</u>
a) 10 Mead Lane, Chertsey – planning appeal regarding demolition of existing double garage and erection of 4 one-bedroom flats (RU 08/0234)	DISMISSED
b) ‘Halvergate’, 221 Station Road, Addlestone – construction of a crossover to provide vehicular access to front of property for parking (RU 08/0778)	DISMISSED

552. PLANNING APPLICATIONS DETERMINED BY DIRECTOR OF TECHNICAL SERVICES

A list of planning applications recently determined by the Director of Technical Services under his delegated powers was noted. Officers would notify Councillor Mrs Gillham of reasons for refusal on application RU 09/0020.

553. FINANCIAL MONITORING STATEMENT

The Committee was informed of the latest financial projections for the 2008/09 financial year for Planning and Development services.

The income from planning applications fees was now looking more positive.

554. STANDING ORDER 42 – URGENT ACTION

The Committee noted that the following action had been taken after consultation with the Chairman of the Committee under Standing Order 42.

<u>Officer</u>	<u>Action Taken</u>	<u>Central Index No</u>
Director of Technical Services	Chertsey Town Football Club, Alwyns Lane, Chertsey – Making of Tree Preservation Order	683
Director of Technical Services	Land adjoining Wey Navigation/Thames Lock – Making of Area Tree Preservation Order	684

Chairman

(The meeting ended at 9.30pm)